

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2005**

At 3:05 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Sue Lempert in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: David Bauer, Jim Bigelow, Deborah Bringelson, Judith Christensen, Tom Davids, Vice Chair Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Irene O'Connell, Barbara Pierce, Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Walter Martone and Sandy Wong (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Tom Madalena and Mark Duino (C/CAG Staff – County Planning), Richard Napier (C/CAG Executive Director).

Two new members of CMAQ were introduced – Judith Christensen, Councilwoman from Daly City, and David Bauer, Councilman from Belmont.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of January 31, 2005 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. O'Connell/Richardson, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Approval of report on Transportation Data – Census 2000.

Mark Duino reported on the most recent information about transportation trends from the 2000 Census:

Staff intends to analyze this data for the purpose of developing recommendations for ways to increase transit ridership.

There is a high potential to increase transit ridership in the San Francisco to San Mateo, San Mateo to San Francisco, San Mateo to Santa Clara, Santa Clara to San Mateo, and San Mateo to San Mateo County corridors. There is not as much potential to increase transit ridership in the corridors connecting San Mateo and Contra Costa or Alameda County corridors.

The San Mateo to San Francisco Corridor has the highest transit ridership of all the

corridors with 20% using transit to go from San Mateo to San Francisco. 45% of all transit trips are in this corridor.

Staff intends to make an estimate of the potential transit usage based on the data, to use as a target for doing future planning of programs to increase transit usage.

54% of all transit trips that originate in San Mateo County plus Santa Clara County, end in San Francisco.

75% of all of the transit trips going from San Mateo County to San Francisco are coming from only five cities – Daly City, South San Francisco, Pacifica, San Mateo, and San Bruno.

Questions/Comments:

What is the difference between the % under transit and the % of all transit trips in the corridor? The % under transit is what % of the total trips in that corridor are transit trips. The % of all transit trips in the corridor is what % of the total transit trips in all corridors are in that particular corridor.

Are these commute hour trips or all trips? Work trips only, regardless of the time of day that the individual is commuting to and from work.

Is the ultimate goal of this analysis to increase transit ridership or to decrease congestion, or both? Both.

It would be interesting to find out how successful individual jurisdictions are in convincing employers to hire local workers. Do we need to develop a campaign to get San Mateo County employers to hire San Mateo County residents? This would help to address the housing shortage and the commuting congestion. It is possible that you will find different potential solutions depending on the corridor analyzed.

We need to discuss further the concept of providing incentives for workforce housing. C/CAG Staff should come back with some recommendations and suggestions for how this might be addressed. One suggestion might be to hold job fairs for local employers and local workers.

Looking at corridors where we can have the greatest impact appears to be a rational approach to planning for ways to increase transit ridership.

We need to identify why the current situation (as illustrated by the data) is what it is, and what can be done to impact that situation. How are we working with SamTrans and other transit providers on these issues? We need to invite transit agency staff to come to CMAQ and present the things that they may already be planning to do to increase ridership in these high potential corridors.

We should also be considering shuttle use as a way to ensure that potential transit riders have better access to transit services. Shuttle services are something that C/CAG can have a significant impact on as a major funder of these services. C/CAG Staff was requested to factor shuttle usage and available shuttle services into this data.

A number of the single occupant commuters from San Mateo to San Francisco may be going to jobs where they simply report in and then have to be on the road (i.e. sales), others may be heading for parts of San Francisco where connections to other transit systems is inadequate.

The numbers appear to show that the reverse commute (going south to Silicon Valley) is no longer the case because over half of the transit riders are going to San Francisco.

This data does not reflect the increased CalTrain ridership resulting from the “Baby Bullet” trains and the addition of BART service to San Francisco Airport and Millbrae. Even though over 50% of the transit riders are commuting to San Francisco, this still represents a significant change in the commute patterns of a few decades ago when over 85% of the transit riders when to San Francisco.

The numbers may be skewed somewhat because many individuals live in areas not served by transit.

Although this information is excellent, it is from the 2000 Census, which is already five years old. Many things have changed since then. We need to supplement this information with other more current data in order to have a solid basis for making decisions.

Unfortunately the information that we are just now getting from the Census has taken four years for the Census Bureau to make available. MTC and the various transit agencies may have some more up to date data.

Should we be concentrating on numbers alone, or should mileage be factored in? Concentrate on commuters that might be traveling a longer distance?

The 2020 Peninsula Corridor Gateway Study and the Ramp Metering Study shows that there is an increasing load on Route 101, while at the same time the “Baby Bullet” trains are zooming along. This may be an opportunity to attract some of the longer commuters. Another way of analyzing the data might be to look at individual cities compared to its population and the opportunities to use transit in that city.

We need to include all of the San Mateo County cities in the data and analysis because C/CAG represents all jurisdictions, instead of just targeting certain jurisdictions.

Our plans should tie in with proposed development at the individual cities and C/CAG’s promotion of Transit Oriented Development.

Staff was requested to also show what are the implications of implementing some of these suggestions. Show how the impacts of doing something in one jurisdiction may also affect other jurisdictions.

We should also look at ways to encourage carpooling, especially in those less dense neighborhoods where there is no transit service. The Alliance may be able to play a role in the implementation of carpooling options.

Shuttles are extremely important to reach residents living up in the hills and connecting them with destinations and also regional transit service.

Is there a way to reach out to San Francisco companies that employ San Mateo County residents and provide incentives to get them to use transit?

4. Recommendation for the adoption of a Resolution in accordance with Chapter 2.65 (commencing with sections 65089.11) to Division 1 of Title 7 of the California Government Code (Assembly Bill 1546):

- a) Providing for a fee of four dollars (\$4.00) on motor vehicles registered within San Mateo County; and**
- b) Adopting a corresponding program and budget for the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution within San Mateo County; and**
- c) Making a finding of fact that those programs bear a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that will pay the fee; and**
- d) Adopting performance measures for those programs.**

This item is coming before the CMAQ and C/CAG Board to address all of the legal issues that are required prior to the implementation of the Vehicle Registration Fee that was authorized under AB 1546. Walter Martone reviewed a number of changes to the materials that have been recommended by C/CAG Legal Counsel. They include:

The Hydrogen fuel cell program has been broadened to include other clean fuel technologies and the nexus to the motor vehicle has been clarified to show that the program will be to create shuttle services.

Managing runoff from parking lots has been expanded to include both impervious and pervious surfaces.

Documentation has also been provided to show that the actual cost of the programs to be funded by the Fee will greatly exceed the revenues that will be generated by the Fee.

Finally a list of performance measures has been developed to document how we will determine the quantity of services provided with the proceeds of the Fee. Two new performance measures were verbally reported by Staff. NPDES consulting assistance will be measured by the number of consulting hours provided; and the brake pad partnership will be measured by the number of studies participated in.

Comments:

It was recommended that the training and implementation of non-profit car wash Best Management Practices should be expanded to include commercial car wash businesses.

This program will not require the cities to implement new services. AB 1546 will reimburse the cities for the activities that they are already implementing. New and expanded services will be created and funded under the 50% portion of AB 1546 that will be administered by C/CAG.

It was noted that the budget amount for DMV services was just a projection. The most recent estimate is actually lower - \$100,000 to \$110,000.

Concern was expressed about what to do when the funding expires. Staff indicated that if the program is successful, C/CAG will likely request an extension. We are also being very clear that this funding is limited and not guaranteed beyond the expiration date of the law (January 2009).

It was noted that the list of allowable programs is firm and does not allow leeway for modification/additions.

The performance measures do not have to establish standards at this time. This will be done after the program is underway.

Motion: To accept the report as amended by the staff comments and comments of Committee Members. Bigelow/Pierce, unanimous.

5. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for March 28, 2005. At 4:35 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.